DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 050 LI 001 351

By-Harris, Linda S.

Readership Study of the "Review of Educational Research".

Stanford Univ., Calif. Inst. for Communication Research.
Spons Agency-American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 3 Feb 69
Note-99p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.05
Descriptors-Communication (Thought Transfer), *Educational Researchers, Evaluation, Information Dissemination, Information Seeking, *Information Utilization, *Literature Reviews, *Periodicals, *Use Studies
Identifiers-*Review of Educational Research

Approval and use of the 15 issues of the Review of Educational Research which appeared from June, 1965 to June, 1968 were determined for each issue separately and for all the issues as a set. The survey respondents, all members of the American Educational Research Association, were teachers, administrators, consultants, and researchers. Half had Ph.D's and most were authors of papers and articles as well as active readers of other journals. They advocated more frequent review of several topics. Respondents proposed changes to improve the writing style, editorial quality, and scope of the Review. Half indicated they would prefer an annual review of educational research to the current Review. Overall use of the journal was found to be moderate, partly because each educational researcher tends to read issues only in his areas of specialization. Two major uses of the Review were for current awareness and for learning about areas peripheral to one's speciality. In addition, the Review acted as a stimulus to information-seeking. The author recommended changes in format and content so that each issue would appeal to specialists on the topic reviewed and also to a more general audience attracted by current awareness features. (Author/CC)

EDO 27050

IR 001 251

READERSHIP STUDY OF THE

REVIEW OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

READERSHIP STUDY OF THE

REVIEW OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

by

Linda S. Harris

Institute for Communication Research

Stanford University

February 3, 1969

(Research conducted under a grant from the American Educational Research Association)

ABSTRACT

In this readership study of the Review of Educational Research, approval and use of the 15 issues within the three-year cycle from June, 1965 to June, 1968 are determined for each issue separately and for all the issues as a set. The survey respondents, who are all members of the American Educational Research Association, teach, administer, consult, and engage in research projects. Half have PhD's and most are authors of papers and journal articles as well as active readers of other journals. They advocate more frequent review of several topics, which happen to be topics of the issues that are used the most. Respondents propose changes to improve the writing style, editorial quality, and scope of the Review. Half would prefer an annual review of educational research to the current Review. Overall use of the journal is moderate, partly because each educational researcher tends to read issues only in his areas of specialization. The Review is used for several different purposes; two major uses are for current awareness and for learning about areas peripheral to one's specialty. In addition, the Review acts as a stimulus to information-seeking in connection with the publications cited. The author recommends changes in format and in content so that each issue would appeal to specialists on the topic reviewed and also to a more general audience attracted by current awareness features designed especially for them.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is very grateful to Christine Laukat, Peter Lederman, and Linda Sikorski for their assistance in coding and keypunching the data; to Michele Timbie and Jack Hershey for their editorial aid and moral support; and to Mrs. Beatrice Saunders for typing the report.

Special thanks go to Dr. William J. Paisley for his advice throughout the study.

CONTENTS

Abstract 1

Acknowledgements ii

List of Tables iv

Introduction 1

I. Description of the Questionnaire 5

II. Characteristics of Questionnaire Respondents 6

III. Use of the Review 8

A. Frequency of Review 9
B. Extent of Use 14
C. Purposes of Use 19
D. Consequences of Use: Impact of the Review 23

IV. Characteristics of Review Users 25

Introduction: Explanation of Notation in Tables 26
A. Use of Each Issue According to Professional Specialty 31
B. Conclusions Regarding Professional Specialty 37
C. Use of Each Issue According to Job Activity 38
D. Summary: Use of the Review According to Job Activity 42
•Entr'acte 44
E. Correlates of Eight Reasons for Using the Review 46
F. Correlates of Seven Consequences of Using the Review 49
G. Implications of These Correlations 52

V. How to Improve the Review of Educational Research 53

VI. Potential for an Annual Review of Educational Research 59

VII. Summary and Conclusions 65

A. Summary of Major Findings 66
B. Changes Explicitly Suggested by Respondents 68
C. Changes Inferred from the Survey Data 69

Tables 72

Appendixes 85

I. Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents 86
II. The Questionnaire 89

LIST OF TABLES

(Tables are in numerical order, starting on page 72.)

Table	Title
I	Basic Results: How Often Should This Topic Be Reviewed?
II	Ranking of Issues According to Popularity or Those That Should Be Reviewed More Often
III	Cumulative Percentages of Response: Frequency of Review
IV	Basic Results: How Much Did You Use This Issue?
V	Ranking of Issues According to Extent of Use, Based on the Average Use of Each Issue for Skimming, Selective Reading, and Extensive Reading
VI	Cumulative Percentages of Response: Extent of Use
VII	Cumulative Percentages of Response: Use of the Review for Different Purposes
VIII	Cumulative Percentages of Response: Impact of the Review
IX	Deviations from Expected Use of Each Issue, Due to Professional Specialty
X	Deviations from Expected Use of Each Issue, Due to Job Activity
XI	Correlates of Eight Reasons for Using the Review
XII	Correlates of Seven Consequences of Using the Review

INTRODUCTION

An aid to professional communication such as the Review of Educational Research can be studied from many different points of view and with many different goals. The various points of view include impact and effectiveness, and the goals include making editorial or technical changes. This study of the Review seeks to understand both the impact and the effectiveness of the journal, with the goal of recommending policies that will enhance it as a communication tool.

Measuring the effectiveness of a communication technique means measuring how well it does the job for which it was intended. Measuring the impact means measuring changes in communication patterns or habits that may accompany use of that particular tool. For example, the effectiveness of the Review was measured in this questionnaire survey in two basic questions:

- How much did respondents use each issue?
- What did they use the issues for?

Two-way contingency tables were used to analyze further the journal's effectiveness--e.g., to see how useful for counselors the issue on guidance and counseling was. The impact of the Review was measured by asking respondents what happened as they read each issue--that is, what impact each issue had on their behavior:

- Did they recognize cited publications from previous reading?
- Did they try to contact an author of a cited publication?

These and the other questions asked represent only one approach to measures of the effectiveness and impact of the Review. A policy change

that would improve the journal should be based on information from many sources, but these measures of actual use and impact can lend a strong base of information to the decision-making process. This study answers two broad policy questions:

- How can the Review be improved?
- How desirable is an annual review of educational research?

The validity of the survey itself rests on recognizing the importance of professional journal literature and reviews. Joseph Kuney, in the 1968 Annual Review of Information Science and Technology,[1] properly labels the printed journal as "the most widely used tool offered by the present system of information transfer." Kuney implies that the planning and producing of journals to serve various purposes and to satisfy user needs is an art. According to a related study by Gannett, the frightening rate of literature growth in all fields will result in:

> an increasing emphasis on secondary publication services, such as abstract journals, indexes, current awareness bulletins, and on any other information services that will enable the individual to feel that he is somehow coming to grips with the literature.[2]

Even though Kuney agrees with the urgent need for these secondary services and the need for critical reviews and progress reports, he is also concerned with maintenance of journals that serve multiple functions. For example, this study found that the Review of Educational Research serves current awareness and reference functions, among others. Most

---

[1] Kuney, Joseph H., "Publication and Distribution of Information," in: Cuadra, Carlos A., ed., Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, Vol. III, (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc.), 1968.

[2] Gannett, K.K., "Technical Journals and the Information Explosion," in Proceedings of the 14th International Technical Communications Conference (Washington, D.C.) 1967.

other information tools do not fill multiple roles. Kumey concludes that higher selectivity in journal contents might be best effected at a "mission-oriented" level, while the role of the discipline-oriented publisher would be to "wholesale" papers to mission-oriented information centers. The importance of critical reviews for condensing and organizing the huge volume of education research information and also for serving more than one function cannot be denied.

What kind of an educational research review is optimal? The advantages of the Review of Educational Research, which covers one topic area on the average of every three years, must be compared with the advantages of an annual review of educational research. The decision to publish an annual review entails considerations of the growth rate of literature in the various topic areas to be reviewed and the popularity and relevance of topics for different user groups. Several questions in this survey investigated these factors.

Apart from the quandary of coping with the infamous "information explosion," there are problems specific to information exchange in the field of education, whose information users include everyone from U.S. Office of Education administrators and Title III directors to university professors and (a few!) elementary school teachers. As a result, journals in the field of education are diverse in scope and sophistication. The Review of Educational Research, with its cycle of 15 topics, is tackling the scope problem at a single level of sophistication.

Changes for the Review suggested in the survey encompass both scope (changes in the frequency of review of certain topics and the addition and deletion of others) and sophistication (suggestions for

"more critical" reviews instead of reviews that seem to be merely bibliographies of the current literature).

With this setting for the survey and statement of the problems, let us inspect the procedure and results.

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The two policy questions mentioned above--how to improve the Review, and how desirable is an annual review of educational research--encompass a host of smaller questions that also were included in this survey. For example, knowledge of how much the Review is used, what it is used for, and what types of readers use it is necessary to answer both the policy questions.

A four-page questionnaire (which is appended to this report) was sent to 1006 non-institutional members of the American Educational Research Association (AERA); they represented a systematic sample of one-eighth of the total AERA membership. After two mailings, the response rate was 60%, or 607 questionnaires, of which 572 had enough questions answered to be useable. These 572 compose the data set used in this analysis.

The questions require respondents to think back over the past three years and remember whether and how they used specific issues of the Review. This is a difficult task; lapse of memory may be responsible for the high rate of non-response to some of the questions.

Each of four basic questions had to be answered for each of the 15 issues of the Review from June, 1965 to June, 1968, a three-year cycle. We shall label these four questions: frequency-of-review, extent-of-use, purposes-of-use, and results-of-use.

II. CHARACTERISTICS OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENTS

Knowledge of the demographic traits of respondents is necessary to fully analyze their use of the Review and their non-use and to posit explanations for that behavior. Appendix I shows results of the demographic questions asked on the back page of the questionnaire.

The survey respondents represent an elite group of educators in teaching, research, and administrative settings. Research or administration is the primary job activity for 41%, and teaching is the primary activity for 39%. Not unexpectedly, 68% are employed in a college or university. Research methodology is the primary professional specialty for 23% of the respondents, and another 12% are primarily engaged in educational administration. Furthermore, almost half of the respondents received their highest degree from an institution classified by the 1966 Carrter report[1] as a top quality institution in graduate education. Finally, the highest earned degree is a PhD (or MD) for 44% of the respondents. Almost 60% of these highest degrees were earned after 1961; the fields represented by the largest respondent groups are education (32%), educational psychology (15%), and educational administration (15%).

The respondents are unusually active journal readers and authors of papers and articles. A quarter of the respondents claim to read seven

---

[1] The Carrter Report: An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education, by Alan M. Carrter, (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966).

or more journals regularly, and an additional 47% read four to six regularly. They are also prolific authors: 42% have written five or more unpublished papers or reports within the past five years, and 26% have published four or more journal articles within that time span. Thirteen percent have also written at least one chapter in a book, and 13% also have written at least one book over the past five years.

III. USE OF THE REVIEW

Findings from Four Basic Questions on:

A. Ideal Frequency of Review

B. Extent of Use

C. Purposes of Use

D. Consequences of Use: Impact of the Review

A. FREQUENCY OF REVIEW

Basic Results

This is the text of the frequency-of-review question:

HOW OFTEN SHOULD THIS TOPIC BE REVIEWED?
(Circle the most appropriate choice.)

This topic should be:

1--retained as is (reviewed every 3 years)
2--reviewed more often
3--reviewed less often
4--excluded from the Review
5--modified or subdivided: Please list new titles in question 4 below

(The titles of the issues were listed in reverse chronological order, with the numbers 1 through 5 opposite each title.) The new titles that were suggested are summarized in Section V: How to Improve the Review.

Table I shows the replies to this question for the 572 respondents. The popularity of the issues, or how often they should be reviewed, varies extensively. For example: 54% of the respondents would like to see "Instructional Materials" reviewed more often than every three years, but only 12% would like to see "International Development Education" reviewed more often. The percentages in the Reviewed Less Often column are complementary to these: only 3% would like to see "Instructional Materials" reviewed less often, while 23% (the highest percentage in that column) think that "International Development Education" should be reviewed less often. About half the replies for each issue favor a Retained As Is policy, and very few favor the Excluded or Modified options.

We can discuss these results in Table I in two ways: by talking about the average response percentage for each choice in the frequency-of-review question, and thus the average or typical issue; and by ranking the titles according to their relative popularity--that is, those that should be reviewed more and less often. The ranks of the titles are shown in Table II. The average response percentages for the typical issue are presented below.

Average Frequency: The Typical Issue

These are the average percentages of response (over 15 issues) for each portion of the question:

HOW OFTEN SHOULD THIS TOPIC BE REVIEWED?	THIS TOPIC SHOULD BE:
retained as is (i.e., reviewed every 3 years)	47%
reviewed more often	30
reviewed less often	11
excluded from the Review	2
modified or subdivided	1
average non-response	9
	100%

As might be expected, almost half the survey respondents, on the average, think that the typical issue should be retained in a three-year cycle. Motivation to retain the status quo, whether due to lack of imagination or lack of energy, is always strong. However, the fact that an average of 30% think that the typical issue should be reviewed more often and only 11% think that it should be reviewed less often is noteworthy. The former, and larger, group of educational researchers feels that developments in many areas are rapid enough to warrant more frequent attention and review. Finally, the low response percentages for the Excluded and Modified choices, viewed along with

the high percentages for the other three choices, may be interpreted as the reflection of general interest in the topics as they exist and as a preference to alter the cycle rather than the contents of individual issues.

Relative Frequency: Ranking the Issues

Table II shows the ranking of titles according to their popularity, or how often they should be reviewed. It is interesting to note that the most popular issue and the least popular issue are the two most recent ones published (at the time the questionnaire was distributed). "Instructional Materials" was published four months prior to distribution of the questionnaire, and "International Development Education" two months prior. (The impact of "International Development Education" may not have been felt yet, since this was the inaugural issue.)

The reasons for preferences regarding frequency of review undoubtedly reflect respondents' perceptions of the rate of literature growth in each topic area, their individual interests in that area, and the availability of reviews and information about that topic in other professional journals and published materials. For example, "Education for Socially Disadvantaged Children," one of the most popular issues, currently is an active research area, and many educational researchers could easily profit from an overview of the topic. On the other hand, "Educational Organization, Administration, and Finance" is also a crucial area in the general field of education today, but only the sub-group of respondents who specialize in that area seem to use this issue of the Review (as will be shown later).

Frequency: An Overview

Instead of analyzing the popularity of each individual issue, let us consider respondents' satisfaction with the entire set of 15 issues that have appeared over the past three years. Table III shows the cumulative response percentages for the number of issues that should be retained, reviewed more often, and so forth. For the Retained portion of the question, a third of the respondents think that no more than six issues should be retained in a three-year cycle. Half think that no more than eight (or about half the issues) should be retained. In the same manner, about three-fourths think that no more than 10 issues should be retained. In other words, the bulk of these respondents would like to see the cycle of at least five issues changed, and half the respondents would like to see the cycle of at least seven issues changed. This is a considerable mandate to the editor!

The type of change desired by most respondents is a change in the frequency of review and not exclusion or modification of the topic, as can be seen in Table I. The specific titles of the issues that should be reviewed more or less often are found in Table II. Table III, though, gives an overview.

From this table, it is evident that, considering those who replied to the Reviewed More Often portion of the question, as many as a quarter favor reviewing at least seven topics more often--this is about half the number of issues in a three-year cycle. In addition, almost half the respondents think that at least five topics

should be reviewed more often. Most think that at least one or two topics should be reviewed more often, but this is not too startling because these topics could easily be the one or two areas of specialization for each respondent.

Respondents aren't as inclined to request less frequent appearances of some issues. In fact, only about half of all the 572 respondents want to see even one issue less often. This probably means that a researcher sees no logical reason for the amount of information available to him to be reduced. Only 16% of the Less Often group think that any more than five issues should be reviewed less often--a small percentage indeed.

Finally, only 94 people give any response at all to the Excluded choice, and 70 to the Modified category. And the number of issues that most of these respondents think should be excluded or modified is only one or two. These results might be explained by the fact that excluding a topic is a rather severe fate that respondents might be reluctant to recommend, and modifying a topic might require too much respondent effort in creating a new title.

B. EXTENT OF USE

Basic Results

This is the text of the extent-of-use question:

HOW MUCH DID YOU USE THIS ISSUE?
(Circle the most appropriate choice.)

1--I don't remember/I didn't see it
2--I saw it, but didn't use it
3--I only skimmed it
4--I read selected parts
5--I read almost the entire issue

(As in the previous question, the titles of the issues were listed in reverse chronological order, with the numbers 1 through 5 opposite each title.) In the discussion, and in other tables to be presented later, we will refer to reading "selected parts" as reading selectively, and reading "almost the entire issue" as reading extensively.

Table IV shows how much the use of each issue varies among all 572 questionnaire respondents. For example, only 13% failed to either skim or read the issue "Growth, Development, and Learning," while 49% failed to use the issue "International Development Education."

The highest percent in the column "Read Almost Entire Issue" is only 29%, a rather small number for any one issue. But if the people who "read selected parts" of the different issues are added to those who read extensively, a more acceptable rate of use is obtained. Furthermore, use of the Review is highly dependent on one's specialty, as will be reported later, so these results may not be so disappointing after all.

Another interesting finding displayed in Table IV is that as many as one-quarter of the respondents saw but didn't use three issues,

"International Development Education," "Educational Organization, Administration, and Finance," and "Language Arts and Fine Arts." Although this again may reflect the dependency of use on professional specialty, other reasons for these results are not known.

Average Use: The Typical Issue

These are the average percentages of response (over 15 issues) for the question:

HOW MUCH DID YOU USE THIS ISSUE?

I don't remember/I didn't see it	13%
I saw it, but didn't use it	16
I only skimmed it	22
I read selected parts	24
I read almost the entire issue	16
average non-response	7
	100%

These figures demonstrate that the average or "typical" issue was read, at least in part, by about 40% of the survey respondents, and skimmed by an additional 22%. An average of about a third of the respondents, then, didn't use a typical issue at all over the past three years, even though the Review is mailed to them as a feature of membership in AERA.[1]

Relative Use: Ranking the Issues

The data for use of each issue listed in Table IV lead to ranking the 15 issues based on the simple average for each issue of skimming, reading selectively, and reading extensively. This ranking, presented in Table V, indicates that, in general, the issues that are used the

---

[1] A comparison of users and non-users for all 15 issues shows that, in general, they do not differ significantly as to demographic or productivity variables.

most are also the most popular issues, as can be seen by comparing Tables V and II. From this observation, we conclude that respondents' opinions on how often topics in educational research should be reviewed are probably based on their actual use of the Review, and not on casual thoughts.

Use: An Overview

The cumulative response percentages shown in Table VI demonstrate that use of the Review is not overwhelming, but neither is it extraordinarily low. Most of the respondents use less than half the issues--and this, again, is probably related to the finding that readers do not stray very far from their specialties to use other issues of the Review.

The table shows three different extent-of-use distributions.[1] The number of issues used by half the respondents for skimming and selective reading is four, and for extensive reading, two. That is, half the respondents who skim any issues at all, skim four, and half the respondents who read selectively in any issues at all, read in four. Only 20% of the extensive readers use any more than four issues. It is unfortunate that, due to the complex data coding procedure, we have no overall measure of the number of issues skimmed and read by the same respondents. However, inspection of the table allows us to understand that three or four issues account for the extensive reading done by most respondents, whereas five or six

---

[1] (The table does not show the number of issues not used -- a meaningless phrase.)

issues account for their skimming and selective reading. Results to be displayed later show that the extensive reading tends to be limited to respondents' specialties, and other use of the Review might be for learning about new areas or checking a reference.

The response distributions for skimming and selective reading are almost identical. This may indicate that respondents did not distinguish the two very carefully.

These figures may underestimate actual use of the Review, possibly because respondents had difficulty recalling their use of the journal over the three-year period, or because the questionnaire was relatively complicated. However, the results are probably accurate, for at least three reasons. First, lapse of memory is not a likely reason, because the list of issue titles provides "aided recall." If respondents could not recall their use of the Review even with aid, they must not have used it very much--or else it did not make a significant impression on their memory, a more serious fault. Second, readership of other journals by questionnaire respondents is unusually high; and other information use studies indicate that use of journals should be highly correlated with use of other publications, such as the Review. (Reading other journals is in fact strongly correlated with use of the Review, as will be shown later.) Finally, these survey respondents are an elite group of educational researchers who produce many papers and publish articles, chapters, and books. This high research output presumably is based on a voluminous input of information, but the Review apparently does not contribute a significant amount to this input. Thus, we must conclude that use of the Review

by this elite group of educational researchers is only moderate. Some of the reasons for this can be seen in the suggestions for improvement of the Review.

C. PURPOSES OF USE

Basic Results

This is the text of the purposes-of-use question:

WHAT DID YOU USE THIS ISSUE FOR?
(Circle all choices that apply.)

1--To keep up with current work in my specialty
2--To make sure I hadn't missed important literature in my specialty
3--To learn about an area outside my specialty
4--To verify a fact or conclusion
5--To check a reference
6--To teach a course
7--To prepare a lecture or speech
8--To write a paper or report

(As before, the titles of the issues were listed in reverse chronological order, with the numbers 1 through 8 opposite each title.) These choices represent conventional goals of information-seeking. The first three can be classified as current awareness or continuing education goals, and the next two as reference goals. The last three choices actually are activities for which the information will be used, rather than goals of information-seeking. Nevertheless, they were included because they are important options, irregardless of their form.

Table VII shows the cumulative response percentages for the number of issues used for each purpose.[1]

The high rate of non-response for the latter

---

[1]We have no measure of how many respondents used each issue for each of the purposes, because reduction of this data would be too difficult.

five purposes is probably the result of: the complexity of the question; the moderate rate of use for the Review as a whole; and (most likely) the specificity of these five choices. By specificity we mean that only one issue of the Review would have to be used to check a reference, for example, or to write a paper or report, and such solitary use might be difficult to remember. It is much easier and probably just as accurate for respondents to say that they use the Review for general goals such as keeping up with the literature.

Keeping up is acknowledged to be an important function served by review publications, and the data certainly support this notion. A parallel use of the Review is "to make sure I hadn't missed important literature in my specialty." The response distributions of the number of issues used for each of these purposes are unusually similar, indicating that the two uses are functionally equivalent. The motives that prompt each use may differ considerably, however. Furthermore, the rate at which the Review is used for these two purposes is slightly less than the rate for using the Review to learn about an area peripheral to one's specialty. Three issues are used by half the respondents who use the Review to keep up and to "make sure," but five issues are used by half the respondents who want to learn about a new area. It's logical that once a reader decides he wants to learn, he won't stop with just one issue.

Even though only one issue may be necessary to check a reference, it's surprising that the Review isn't used repeatedly for this purpose--only 134 respondents report using the Review this way over

the three-year period. An established literature review with comprehensive bibliographies should be a very handy reference for researchers. The reference function may be reflected in use of the Review for writing a paper or report, but this still does not account for so few respondents using the journal for reference.

Another surprising finding is that only 161 use the Review to teach a course, but more than 300 claim that teaching is one of their two primary job activities. However, a critical review of the literature often presumes rather extensive knowledge of the field, therefore making it inappropriate for teaching novices. On the other hand, a well-written, comprehensive review could highlight for novices the best literature that the field has to offer; this is valuable knowledge for someone just beginning to attack the literature in a new and complex areas.

It is difficult to say whether a change in format or in style of writing would affect these uses. An editorial change that could feasibly reduce use of the Review for keeping up, "making sure," or learning would not be wise. Despite the low response rates for the last five uses, the fact remains that the Review does serve all eight purposes to some degree--and this is unusual for a single information tool. Textbooks provide orientation to the field of inquiry; journal articles usually convey "current awareness" information about particular new concepts or activities; and bibliographies, particularly selective ones, point to useful literature. The Review serves all of these--and probably more. Consideration of any editorial changes

would have to include a decision on how many different functions the Review should serve, and which ones should be given the most attention.

D. CONSEQUENCES OF USE: IMPACT OF THE REVIEW

Basic Results

This is the text of the consequences-of-use question:

WHAT HAPPENED AS YOU USED THIS ISSUE?
(Circle all choices that apply.)

1--I recognized some cited publications from previous reading
2--I tried to obtain cited publications
3--1 read a cited publication
4--I tried to contact the author of a publication
5--I prepared a bibliography of my own
6--I modified a current research project
7--I gained a new perspective on educational research

(Again, the titles of the issues were listed in reverse chronological order, with the numbers 1 through 7 opposite each title.) These responses are measures of impact of the Review--measures of ways that the Review stimulates readers' communication and information exchange patterns. The behavior represented by some of these choices, such as "recognizing cited publications" or "gaining a new perspective on educational research," requires very little effort. Higher response rates were anticipated and received for the options reflecting the least effortful behavior. Despite this, the response rates generally are low and most of the respondents remember their behavior for one or two issues only.

Table VIII shows the cumulative response percentages for the number of issues that had an impact on respondents' behavior.[1]

The greatest impact of the Review apparently is for people who

---

[1]We have no measure of how many respondents took each of these actions for each of the issues, because reduction of this data would be too difficult.

recognize the cited publications from their previous reading--a perfectly logical result, because a review is a secondary medium by definition. In addition, almost as many respondents who read a cited publication had tried to obtain one. This implies that the search for publications probably was successful for a large portion of those who tried--an unusually happy result in these times when information retrieval is often frustratingly slow and disappointing. Only 78 people tried to contact the author of a publication. Although the majority of these attempts were probably requests for a reprint of the publication, it is a safe guess that some of them were requests for more information about the author's work. This is certainly a stimulus to professional communication, precipitated by the Review. Only 286 respondents gained a new perspective on educational research by reading the Review. This is surprising, in view of the fact that so many more respondents claim to use the Review to learn about an area outside their specialties. Learning should alter one's outlook. It is also noteworthy that 135 respondents modified a research project after reading the Review. Thus, the impact of the Review on professional communication among educational researchers is varied and not terribly strong, except in connection with the publications actually cited in the journal.

IV. CHARACTERISTICS OF REVIEW USERS

Introduction: Explanation of Notation in Tables

A. Use of Each Issue According to Professional Specialty

B. Conclusions Regarding Professional Specialty

C. Use of Each Issue According to Job Activity

D. Summary: Use of the Review According to Job Activity

E. Correlates of Eight Reasons for Using the Review

F. Correlates of Seven Consequences of Using the Review

G. Implications of These Correlations

Introduction: Explanation of Notation in Tables

Changes in editorial policy of the Review must be based on specific information about different types of readers and their reasons for using the journal. The survey data provides this information in four ways:

- Use of Each Issue According to Professional Specialty
- Use of Each Issue According to Job Activity
- Correlates of Eight Reasons for Using the Review
- Correlates of Seven Consequences of Using the Review

Before presenting the data, some basic definitions must be established.

Typical Use

Use of the Review is defined as either skimming, reading selected parts, or reading almost all of at least one issue. In discussing the data, we will often refer to "typical," "normal," "average," or "expected" use of the Review, as a standard for comparing different sub-groups of respondents. This standard equals the percentages actually obtained from questionnaire respondents without subdividing them into smaller groups. By comparing the response percentages for different sub-groups with the standard percentages, we can tell whether the traits being investigated--e.g., highest earned degree--make any difference in use of the Review.

For example, 44% of all survey respondents hold a PhD as their highest earned degree, and the other 56% either hold other degrees or did not respond to the question. These percentages are the norms. But if the entire group of respondents is divided into those who do use the Review to "keep up with the literature" and those who don't use the

Review for that purpose, there might be more than 44% PhD's who do use the Review to keep up. This difference would be noted in the discussion with the words that "those who use the Review for keeping up tend to be PhD's," or "there is an above-average percentage of PhD's among those who use the Review for keeping up." A deviation from the norm of more than three percentage points is significant enough to show that the trait we're interested in does make a difference in use of the Review.

Job Activity Index

To provide a meaningful analysis, the respondents' primary and secondary job activities (see Appendix I) were combined in a single job activity index with six categories. These are the categories and the percentage of the 572 respondents accounted for by each category:

Category	Response Percentage
Teaching/Research	23%
Teaching/Administration	8
Research/Administration	13
Consulting	16
Studying for a degree	15
Other, incl. Writing	14
Non-response	9
	100% (N = 572)

The first three combinations represent respondents who named one activity as a primary job activity and the other as a secondary job activity--no order is implied. The Consulting and Studying categories represent those who mentioned consulting or studying, respectively, as either a primary or secondary activity. Thus, this category includes consultants who are also researchers, teachers, administrators, etc.

The Other category includes those who mentioned writing or "Other" as primary or secondary activities. The categories were created in this manner to yield an optimal division among respondents according to the influence that their activities might have on their information needs and on their use of the Review.

Professional Specialty Indexes

Respondents' professional specialties were combined in a different way than job activities. Primary and secondary specialties form separate indexes, but each index has the same categories:

Index Category:	Response Percentages: Primary Specialty	Secondary Specialty
1. Tests, Measurement, and Research Methodology	23%	15%
2. Instructional Materials and Techniques:	16	18
Includes: Teaching Techniques and Practices; Teaching Aids and Educational Media; Educational Facilities; Curriculum Development		
3. Educational Administration	12	4
4. Counseling	4	3
5. Level of Student:	21	27
Includes: Teacher Education; Higher Education; Secondary Education; Childhood Education; Education of Exceptional Children; Education of the Disadvantaged		
6. Subject:	6	5
Includes: Vocational and Technical Education; Science Education; English Communication Skills; Foreign Languages and Linguistics; Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences		

The specialties School-Community Relationships and International Education are too difficult to group into one of the index categories. And since the number of specialists in these areas is very small, they were excluded from the indexes. The "Other" category was also excluded from the specialty indexes. For each index, then, the percentages above, added to those for the groups not included and those for non-respondents to the question, would sum to 100%, or 572.

A Shorthand for Deviations from Expected Use

The remaining tables presented in this report display deviations from the expected or normal use of the Review--deviations due to the influence of such factors as respondents' job activities and professional specialties. In this manner, the influence of these factors on use of the Review can be determined.

Each table shows deviations only; blank spaces mean that the pattern of use is normal. A deviation represents a difference between the expected and observed frequencies of more than three percentage points. Here is an example, taken from Table IX. Suppose that we want to see which issues are read the most by educational administrators. Looking at the column for educational administrators, the table is interpreted this way:

> A blank space would mean that a reader's specialty does not influence his use of that particular issue. In other words, use of the issue by educational administrators would be no different from use of the issue by a typical respondent,[1] no matter what his specialty.

---

[1] A different "typical" respondent reads each issue. That is, each issue has different norms for use and non-use.

A "+" would mean that educational administrators tend to use the issue opposite the "+" more than the typical respondent.

A "-" would mean that educational administrators tend to use the issue opposite the "-" less than the typical respondent.

For each issue, there are potentially three symbols in each column. The left-hand symbol--whether a plus, minus, or blank--stands for skimming that issue; the middle symbol, for reading selective parts; and the right-hand symbol, for reading almost all of that issue. When inspecting the results in Tables IX and X, it is wise to look for trends within each group of three symbols. For instance, below-normal skimming and selective reading coupled with above-normal extensive reading (- - +) implies a rather strong and comprehensive use of that issue. On the other hand, a pattern like this: (+ -), does not imply a strong trend in either direction.

A. Use of Each Issue According to Professional Specialty

An intriguing question is whether respondents use issues whose topics do not seem to be directly related to their professional specialties. We naturally assume that most users do read issues related to their specialties, and this is confirmed by data presented below. If users read issues unrelated to their primary specialties, then an annual review of educational research might be very well received, because it would link diverse specialty topics in the general field of educational research so that they could be of optimal value for readers.

Table IX shows, for each of the six professional specialties in the specialty index, the deviations from normal use of each issue.[1] The data in the table are for primary specialties only; deviations from normal use by respondents with a secondary specialty in one of the index categories are discussed in the text below. This is the major conclusion:

> •Most skimmers and readers use issues very closely related to their professional specialties.

Now, use of the issues by respondents in each of the specialty categories can be discussed.

1. Tests, Measurement, and Research Methodology: 23%, or 134 respondents.

Understandably, these respondents use two issues, "Educational and Psychological Testing," and "Methodology of Educational Research," much more energetically than the typical respondent. These are the two issues that seem to be most closely associated with a specialty in Tests and Methodology, and they are the only issues in which extensive reading

---

[1] We do not care how many issues are used by respondents in different specialties; instead, the focus is on exactly which issues are used.

is above normal for these respondents. As a statistical consequence of this, skimming and selective reading appear to be below average. Furthermore, although Table IX shows that this group skims some of the issues more than would be expected from the typical respondent, their overall use of the Review is low.

These specialists hold the record for the most issues "seen, but not used" (one of the choices for the extent-of-use question): 10 of the 15 issues! The five issues that didn't fall under their censorious eyes are:

- Educational and Psychological Testing
- Growth, Development, and Learning
- Methodology of Educational Research
- Guidance, Counseling, and Personnel Services
- Education for Socially Disadvantaged Children

The 86 respondents whose secondary specialty is Tests and Methodology don't use the issues on Testing and on Methodology quite as much as the group discussed above. They read selectively in more issues, but they skim less, so their overall use of the 15 issues is about the same as it is for those respondents whose primary specialty is Tests and Methodology.

2. Instructional Materials and Techniques: 16%, or 89 respondents.

This specialty includes the following specialties listed on the questionnaire:

Teaching Techniques and Practices
Teaching Aids and Educational Media
Educational Facilities
Curriculum Development

Use of the Review by these respondents is about normal, although four issues are used more than would be expected. Two of them,

"Instructional Materials," and "Curriculum Planning and Development" are closely related to the specialties listed above. The issue on Testing is used more than expected, for no apparent reason, and the above-normal use of the issue "Language Arts and Fine Arts" is somewhat mysterious, too, because it was one of the least popular among all respondents. However, specialists in areas such as curriculum development or teaching aids might very well be interested enough in language and fine arts to include that issue on their reading lists.

One hundred respondents name Instructional Materials and Techniques as their secondary specialty; they use the issues on Instructional Materials and on Curriculum Planning just about as much as their primary specialty counterparts, but their above-normal use of some other issues is notable too. These other issues are "Growth, Development, and Learning," and "Philosophical and Social Framework of Education." In general, these respondents skim several issues slightly more than normal, while their reading behavior is normal.

3. Educational Administration: 12%, or 71 respondents.

These respondents, logically, read the issue "Educational Organization, Administration, and Finance" a great deal more than would be expected from the typical respondent. As the table shows, they are enthusiastic readers of "Teacher Personnel" and "Methodology of Educational Research." They are also one of two groups whose use of the rather unpopular issue "International Development Education" is slightly above average. Even though these administrators deviate from the norms in several other instances, only one more trend is clear: above-normal skimming, but below-normal reading of the issue on Testing. Many of the fluctuations for administrators can probably be

accounted for by the administrators' busy schedules: they read as much of the Review as they choose, skim some issues, etc. Through this practice, they manage to "keep up" with the information essential to their jobs.

There are only 25 respondents whose <u>secondary</u> specialty is Educational Administration. They, too, use the issue on Educational Organization and Finance with gusto, and they tend to read selectively in "International Development Education." Just as noteworthy is their above-average use of these issues:

- Growth, Development, and Learning
- Teacher Personnel
- Guidance, Counseling, and Personnel Services
- Higher Education

In general, then, use of the Review by this group is quite strong--again, probably due to their administrative roles.

4. <u>Counseling</u>: 4%, or 25 respondents.

Use of the issue "Guidance, Counseling, and Personnel Services" is unanimous among the counselors; not one of them failed to remember this issue, or saw it without using it, even though it had appeared in April of 1966. Extensive reading of the issue is so strong that use for skimming and selective reading actually appear to be below normal--this is simply a statistical result of the unusual data distribution for the issue.

Specializing in counseling affects use of the Review in other ways, too. The issue "Instructional Materials" is not read very much by counselors; in fact, it is one of the issues that they tend to "see, but not use." Their use of the following issues is solid:

- Educational and Psychological Testing
- Curriculum Planning and Development
- Philosophical and Social Framework of Education
- Educational Programs: Adolescence

These all seem to be logically related to counseling.

Since there are only 16 respondents for whom counseling is a secondary specialty, analysis of their use of the Review is difficult. In general, their use is very similar to that of their primary specialty counterparts.

5. Level or Type of Student: 21%, or 122 respondents.

This category includes the following specialties listed on the questionnaire:

Teacher Education
Higher Education
Secondary Education
Childhood Education
Education of Exceptional Children
Education of the Disadvantaged

These respondents have a good record for above-normal extensive reading of at least seven issues, three of which aren't specifically related to one of the student-level specialties:

- Growth, Development, and Learning
- Philosophical and Social Framework of Education
- Language Arts and Fine Arts

These are general education topics, however, and there is no reason why student-level specialists shouldn't be attracted to these issues. The other four are related to at least one of the student-level specialties listed above, and the most-used issue among these is "Higher Education." The issues are:

·Teacher Personnel

·Education for Socially Disadvantaged Children

·Education of Exceptional Children

·Higher Education

Even more respondents (157) have a secondary special interest in student-level than those with a primary interest in student-level. They read extensively in just as many issues as their counterparts, with quite a bit of overlap on the titles, but their skimming is slightly lower than average. Selective reading is normal, and about the same for both groups.

6. Subject: 6%, or 32 respondents.

This category includes these specialties listed on the questionnaire:

Vocational and Technical Education
Science Education
English Communication Skills
Foreign Languages and Linguistics
Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences

Uneven and below-normal use of the Review is the main characteristic of those who specialize in teaching one of these subjects. These respondents show strong use of the Methodology issue, possibly indicating interest in better teaching methods through research in the classroom. They use extensively the issue "Language Arts and Fine Arts" but they are below-average for extensive reading in other areas. Many of the other fluctuations shown in the table may be a statistical result of the small number of cases available for data analysis.

The 29 subject specialists in the secondary group behave in just about the same way as their primary counterparts.

B. Conclusions Regarding Professional Specialty

In general, then, we conclude that use of the Review is highly dependent on the match between professional specialty and topics reviewed in the various issues. Users don't seem to stray too far from their specialties in reading the different issues, although they do stray far enough to report that a major use of the Review, as we have discussed, is for "learning about an area outside my specialty." One policy implication of these findings is that each issue of the Review should have "something for everyone"--that is, some feature to attract the attention of subscribers who don't specialize in the topic reviewed in that particular issue. This feature could be anything from a list of future review authors and topics to brief reviews of new literature or selected bibliographies--anything that would help all AERA members "keep up" with their own specialty areas more often than every three years.

Another implication of the tendency for Review users to pick issues rather close to their specialties is this: A change in the cycle of topics so that the most popular ones would appear more frequently might even encourage readers who don't specialize in those topics to become more aware of the scope and terminology of those areas. Increased readership--or possibly browsing, for current awareness--might be the result.

C. Use of Each Issue According to Job Activity

What are the job activities of Review users? One's job dictates, in part, his information needs but not necessarily his information-seeking habits. These habits often are determined by professional training, work environment, membership in an invisible college, etc., and we will discuss their influence on use of the Review later. Now it is important to classify Review users by their job activities,[1] in order to understand the role of the Review in information use patterns.

Table X shows, for each issue, deviations from the norm due to the influence of job activity.[2] Here is a preview of the main conclusions.

- Consultants and administrators sample the contents of many issues because they must be knowledgeable about many topics.
- Teachers and Researchers sample sometimes and burrow deeper at other times because their information needs probably vary more.

---

[1] One methodological aspect of this analysis of users' job activities and of the remaining analyses of user traits differs from the analysis of professional specialty. Knowing a respondent's specialty might allow us to understand and predict which issues of the Review he would use, so we approached this data by looking at each specialty group separately and determining, for each issue, how many of those specialists skim or read that issue. But job activity is not as good a predictor of use of each issue, so the approach here is to look at each issue separately and then determine how many of the skimmers, selective readers, and extensive readers are included in each activity group. The written text for both analyses does not really reveal this distinction, but the cross-tabulations, from which the data tables are created, do.

[2] We have no reliable measure of the influence of job activity on use of a given <u>number</u> of issues, due to the complexity of coding and keypunching the data.

> •Students use the Review very little--many of them probably have no other activity that clearly specifies their information needs, and as students, their information depend on courses and term papers.

Referring to Table X, we can now discuss deviations from the expected use of each issue due to the five activities in the job activity index. The "Other" job activity category is excluded. The percentage listed after each title is the total of the skimming, selective reading, and extensive reading done for that issue.

Educational and Psychological Testing (Used by: 81%)

Consultants' selective reading of this issue is, surprisingly, below normal. Consultants often advise clients about tests, but this issue must have lacked information the consultants needed, so they turned to other sources.

Growth, Development, and Learning (Used by: 81%)

Teacher/Researchers and Consultants read this issue extensively, and Researcher/Administrators skim it more than expected. The Students, however, skim it less than expected.

Methodology of Educational Research (Used by: 79%)

Most of the 145 Teacher/Researchers use this issue. Researcher/Administrators and Consultants are slightly below-normal users, but the standard for normal use of this issue is high anyway.

Instructional Materials: Educational Media and Technology (Used by: 78%)

Consultants read this issue extensively, but Students are below the norm for extensive reading.

Curriculum Planning and Development (Used by: 67%)

Use of this issue by Teacher/Researchers is inconsistent. They tend to see but not use[1] it more than expected, but they also skim it slightly more than expected. For extensive reading, Consultants are above-normal, but Students are below-normal.

Education for Socially Disadvantaged Children (Used by: 65%)

This issue is used more than expected by Teacher/Administrators, Researcher/Administrators, and Consultants, but Student use is below average.

Guidance, Counseling, and Personnel Services (Used by: 59%)

Extensive reading of this issue by Teacher/Administrators is one of their four deviations from a completely normal pattern of use. The Teacher/Researchers, however, skim this issue, but are below-normal readers, while the Researcher/Administrators are above-normal readers. We might guess that the administrative role precipitates use of this issue, since teachers and researchers have only a passing interest in the issue. Finally, Consultants read it extensively, but Students are below-average readers.

Philosophical and Social Framework of Education (Used by: 58%)

Teacher/Researchers tend to see but not use this issue, and Consultants read selected parts.

---

[1] Even though this response is not shown in Table X, it is interesting to note when the occasion arises.

Educational Programs: Adolescence (Used by: 56%)

Researcher/Administrators tend to see but not use this issue, and Consultants tend to use it extensively.

Education of Exceptional Children (Used by: 56%)

Researcher/Administrators don't use this issue very much, but Consultants read it extensively. Students tend to see but not use it.

Higher Education (Used by: 56%)

Teacher/Administrators and Teacher/Researchers read this issue more than expected, but students are below-average users.

Teacher Personnel (Used by: 55%)

Consultants and Students read this issue extensively, but the other groups do not deviate from a normal pattern of use.

Language Arts and Fine Arts (Used by: 48%)

Use of this issue is highly dependent on the characteristics (and therefore the interests) of the users. Teacher/Researchers read selected parts, Researcher/Administrators skim but don't read it extensively, Consultants skim and read it extensively, and Students are below-average users.

Educational Organization, Administration, and Finance (Used by: 47%)

Understandably, Teacher/Administrators and Research/Administrators use this issue way above average, but Teacher/Researchers are below average for extensive reading. These facts demonstrate the prominence that administrative activities seem to have in prompting use of this issue. Consultants skim this issue a little more than normal, and,

again, Students are below-normal readers.

International Development Education (Used by: 45%)

Teacher/Researchers, the largest activity group, tend to see but not use this issue, which corroborates our earlier discovery that it is neither used very much nor do respondents think that it should be reviewed more often. Nevertheless, it is read selectively by Consultants more than expected, because they need to keep up with developments in many topic areas, whether or not they're actually interested in the topics.

D. SUMMARY: Use of the Review According to Job Activity

Inspection of Table X allows these very general conclusions, that all have exceptions for single issues.

•Teacher/Researchers (N = 145) use the Review for skimming, and reading selectively, more than would be expected, and they read extensively slightly less than expected.

•Teacher/Administrators (N = 46) show a very normal pattern of use, with a few positive deviations for extensive reading.

•Researcher/Administrators (N = 72) skim and read selectively slightly above average, but the deviations for extensive reading seem to balance and result in a normal pattern.

•Consultants (N = 92) are enthusiastic skimmers and extensive readers, but their pattern of selective reading is about normal.

•Students (N = 85) are below-average users in all three areas, and this might be explained in several ways. Students may not be aware of the existence of the Review, for example, or they may have no need for a secondary review of the literature when they're not familiar with

the primary literature.

The most logical explanation for these findings is in the job activities themselves and the information needs they create. That is, administrators and consultants must read widely and obtain information on different topics from many sources, while researchers have very specific information needs. Teaching often is done in conjunction with other activities that require varying types of information. Therefore, it is difficult to generalize about teachers' use of the Review. Finally, students are another group difficult to classify according to their information needs because these needs vary with a student's courses, research projects, and his other activities.

Entr'acte

A frequent finding from information use studies like this one is a positive correlation between abundant use of one information medium (such as the Review) and (1) use of other media, (2) high productivity (e.g., authorship), and (3) excellent professional background (e.g., a recent PhD from a top quality[1] university). Due to the complexity of coding and keypunching the data from the survey, we have no overall measure of extent-of-use (skimming plus selective reading plus extensive reading) for each user to relate to these other factors. We just know that most of the 572 respondents skim at least one issue, read selectively in at least one issue, and read extensively in at least one issue. But we don't know whether, for example, those who skim two issues also read selectively in two or in ten issues. Thus, it would be futile to cross-tabulate the separate extent-of-use measures with other information use, productivity, and professional background variables, because we would not know which type of use might account for a positive correlation.

There is one exception to this restriction. We find that both selective reading and extensive reading of the Review are positively correlated with reading other journals, but skimming is not. These cross-tabulations are meaningful because it does not matter what combination of uses accounts for the correlation. The fact remains that some use of the Review is correlated with reading other journals.

---

[1] Or "major" school--See the footnote re: the Carrter Report in Appendix I.

And since use of the Review and reading other journals are essentially the same behavior, it makes sense that they are correlated.

In spite of these difficulties in measuring extent-of-use, it is perfectly acceptable to look at the numbers of respondents who use the Review at all (that is, at least one issue) for different reasons and with varied consequences to see what their job activities, productivity, and professional background are.

E. Correlates of Eight Reasons for Using the Review

↓

Job Activity
Professional Background
Productivity
Reading Other Journals

Table XI shows the relationship (in terms of deviations from expected frequencies) of job activity, professional background, and productivity to eight reasons for using the Review. Here is a preview of the main conclusions:

- Those who use the journals for fairly specific reasons are active paper and journal authors.
- The activities Teaching and Research are correlated with several of the resons for using the Review.
- Use of the Review for most reasons is positively correlated with reading other journals.

Now, a more detailed discussion of Table XI.

THOSE WHO USE THE REVIEW TO:	TEND TO BE
keep up, and learn	typical: neither their jobs, background, nor productivity influences their reasons for use.
make sure they haven't missed anything	Teacher/Researchers; and journal authors.
verify a fact or conclusion	Teacher/Researchers but not Students; recent PhD's; and paper and journal authors, but not chapter authors.
check a reference	Teacher/Researchers; and paper and journal authors.

THOSE WHO USE THE REVIEW TO:	TEND TO BE:
teach a course	Teacher/Researchers and Teacher/Administrators (naturally!) and Consultants, but not Researcher/ Administrators or Students; recent PhD's in Ed. Psych. or Curriculum; and paper and journal authors.
lecture	Teacher/Researchers and Researcher/Administrators but not Students; PhD's; and authors in every category except books.
write	recent degree in Educational Admin.; and paper authors.

The general conclusion from Table XI is that job activities (especially the combination of Teaching and Research) and authorship of more than four papers and of journal articles during the past five years considerably influence respondents' reasons for using the Review. Teaching and Research seem to be naturally related to the various reasons, such as lecturing, and the strong relationship of paper and journal authorship to use of the Review agrees with our knowledge that significant information input into a scientist's or researcher's head can result in significant information output, in the form of authorship, for example.

More noteworthy than these positive correlations, however, is the paucity of correlations of the variables with the three most common reasons for using the Review, keeping up, making sure, and learning. This may be due to the fact that most of the respondents use the Review for these purposes, and anything that most of the respondents do is typical behavior, by definition. Thus, there are no deviations from

typical behavior for these three reasons shown in the table. Finally, we see that the major/minor school distinction does not influence the reasons for using the Review, but highest earned degree and year of the degree do. A possible explanation: The list of major schools in the Carrter report may not accurately reflect the quality of the Education curriculum at these schools.

Reading other journals (which is not shown in the table) definitely is correlated with all eight reasons for using the Review. The correlation is moderate for the two current awareness reasons and for writing a paper or report, and it is strong for the remaining reasons. These results are not at all surprising, in view of our earlier comment that extensive use of one information tool often implies extensive use of other tools.

F. Correlates of Seven Consequences of Using the Review

↓

Job Activity
Professional Background
Productivity
Reading Other Journals

Table XII shows the relationship (in terms of deviations from expected frequencies) of job activity, professional background, and productivity to seven consequences, or measures of impact, of using the Review.

Here is a preview of the main conclusions:

- Those on whom the Review has fairly specific effects are active paper and journal authors. They also tend to have PhD's.
- The activities Teaching and Research are correlated with several of the consequences of using the Review.
- All consequences of using the Review except one are strongly correlated with reading other journals.

THOSE WHO:	TEND TO BE:
recognized cited publications	typical: neither their jobs, background, nor productivity affect this measure of impact.
tried to obtain a publication	Teacher/Researchers but not Students; PhD's in Curriculum/Guidance; and paper and journal authors.
read a cited publication	Teacher/Researchers; PhD's; and journal authors.
tried to contact an author	Teacher/Researchers but not Students; PhD's from a major school, in Educational Administration but not Curriculum; and paper, journal, and chapter authors.

THOSE WHO:	TEND TO BE:
prepared a bibliography	Teacher/Researchers but not Researcher/Administrators; and paper, journal, and chapter authors. Background makes no difference.
modified ongoing research	Teacher/Researchers; PhD's from a major school, in Educational Administration; and paper, journal, and book authors.
gained a new perspective	typical, with the exception of holding degrees in the field of Curriculum and Guidance.

We see that these consequences or impact of Review use are related to four of the same variables as are the reasons for Review use. The four are Teaching/Research job activities, holding a PhD, authorship of papers, and authorship of journal articles. This finding reinforces our earlier notion that respondents are an elite group of productive researchers. The field and school of one's highest degree have about equal significance in both tables, but earning the degree after 1965 does not influence the consequences of use as much as it does the reasons for use. This is a minor difference.

Table XII also shows no correlates for recognizing cited publications and only one for gaining a new perspective. These responses attracted the largest numbers of people, though, so we must say again that anything such large groups do is typical behavior. This explains the lack of deviations for these two groups.

Reading other journals (which is not shown in the table) again is strongly correlated with all consequences except gaining a new perspective, with which it is negatively correlated. These results are perfectly

logical. Most of the measures of impact refer to publications cited in the Review; someone who reads other journals is sure to know about many of the cited publications. But the reader of other journals probably does not gain a new perspective on educational research precisely because he does not read the Review in isolation. He has the advantage of coming in contact with many different viewpoints, and cannot attribute a new perspective to any one journal or information source.

G. Implications of These Correlations

Discovering that Review users with a variety of characteristics also read other journals actively is reassuring. It shows that the Review is indeed performing its function as a secondary medium that provides a general picture of certain topics in educational research. The Review contains at least one type of information--vital information--that the primary journals do not.

The high proportion of Teacher/Researchers among users suggests that some changes might be made in the Review's format to make it easier for teachers to use it in conjunction with classes. For example, a simple change like printing all citations in boldface might aid teachers hurriedly writing lecture material. (It would actually aid any user interested in picking certain items from each issue.)

Since so many users are also authors of papers and journal articles, a change to a cumulative bibliography in each issue might aid them (and others) in finding publications that they want to cite. Each issue might also have a single list of journals mentioned throughout the issue.

V. HOW TO IMPROVE THE REVIEW OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Since a major goal of this study was to recommend changes in the editorial policies of the Review, several questions were designed to elicit suggestions for improving the journal. We can assume that these suggestions and opinions are offered by fairly regular readers, because many of those who are not regular readers identified themselves as new AERA members and/or not well-acquainted with the Review, and they declined to answer these questions.

Specific Suggestions for Improvement

Question 5 is:

> Please evaluate the general quality of the Review in terms of the authors' style, coverage of the literature, etc. Can you suggest ways to improve the Review in the future?

Respondents to this question number 329: this is 58% of all questionnaires returned. A sampling of the replies shows that slightly more people praise the Review or register satisfaction with it than actually give concrete suggestions for its improvement. However, in several of the replies, phrases of praise are followed by qualifications or criticisms. A typical example:

> In general, I think the quality of chapters in the Review is quite high. I'm not sure that the 'Additional References' portion of bibliographies adds much of value. It often seems to represent the author's inability or unwillingness to discriminate between important (worthy of mention, at least) and unimportant references.

This type of reply, plus another frequent reply--that the quality of the Review is "uneven"--point to the same conclusion: the issues vary widely in quality and style. This is an important finding, and it partially explains the overall low rate of use of the Review.

The majority of respondents who offer explicit suggestions for improving the Review complain about the style of writing. They say that authors should evaluate educational research more critically, and that authors should provide more detailed information, e.g., on results of studies. For example:

> Too many of the Reviews appear disjointed--a simple summary or digest of studies, rather than a critical analysis and/or synthesis. I would prefer the latter approach.
>
> I would appreciate more detail in the Reviews. I had often found reviews attempted to cover too much ground with the result that short shrift was given to everything that was covered.

Other comments stress selection of authors who are highly competent in their specialties and thus well-qualified to write critical reviews. For example:

> These reviews take an enormous amount of time for a conscientious job. Commissioning a highly competent person and giving him time is about the only way, which I am sure is obvious to you.
>
> It appears that "quality" may be affected by the consistency with which the same authors are solicited from one issue to another within a given field. Thus quality varies from one issue to another both within and between fields. One improvement would be to expand the topics--and potential contributions.

This latter comment again points out, the uneveness of the issues, and it a` belongs to an additional class of replies suggesting a change in the Review's contents:

> . . . The field of "higher" education should receive more emphasis in other issues than the specific "higher education" issue. There seems to be a definite elementary and secondary slant in most issues, sometimes to the exclusion of higher education.
>
> Excellent. Would like to see more effort in specialty areas such as Science Education (new curricula, evaluation techniques, etc.).

It is fair to conclude that, although there are many suggestions for improvement, there are also many more words of praise for the publication in realization of the effort required to produce a single issue of the Review.

Suggestions for New or Modified Topics

In response to the portion of the frequency-of-review question that solicited suggestions for new or modified topics for review, 167 (29%) offered advice. However, most of the topics suggested are really modifications of existing topics, modifications that reflect the rapid growth rate of literature in educational research. The only brand new and distinct topics or areas mentioned are:

- Teacher-administration relations, in terms of unions and contracts;
- Urban education and school desegregation;
- The "systems" approach to education;
- Computer application to education, and computer-assisted instruction.

These four topics are mammoth areas to review, of course, but they do represent current and important trends in education. Some of the literature from each of these areas has indeed been reviewed but respondents feel that these areas should be given even more attention.

These are some other examples of new or revised topics suggested:

> Education of pre-school youngsters--not necessarily socially disadvantaged.
>
> Psychobiological research relevant to education, at least as a chapter in "Growth, Development, and Learning." Also, genetic factors relevant to education.
>
> Instructional objectives; instructional product development; curriculum and instruction evaluation; the training and use of tutors in instruction; teacher education.

Teacher competency; elementary children's learning styles.

Educational programs: minority adolescents and adults.

Classroom motivation and management.

Professional relations: board-administration-teachers.

Some of the more technical areas of causes of learning disorders--causes of reading difficulties. Much in the reading field relates to types and symptoms with little attention directed to causation such as now is appearing in the medical literature.

Computer software and hardware developments relevant to educational research.

Computer-assisted instruction. Simulation and gaming.

Language instruction; English as a second language, for disadvantaged children.

Source of Articles

Question 1 asks:

> The present policy of the Review of Educational Research is to commission articles on topics that are normally reviewed every 3 years. Would you prefer a review journal like the Psychological Bulletin, in which articles are spontaneously contributed as often as research in a particular specialty merits the additional coverage? I WOULD PREFER:
>
> _____commissioned articles _____volunteered articles
> _____a combination of both
>
> Please comment. How would the policy you prefer affect the quality of the Review? _____

These are the results:

commissioned	39%
volunteered	5
combination	54
non-response	2

The following summary of the written replies to this question seeks to illuminate these percentages. Not everyone who checked one of the

three choices explained his preference; the response rate for the written replies is only 67%, compared with the 98% who checked one of the three choices.

The prevailing opinion of those who prefer a policy of commissioned articles is that such articles make the Review a unique reference, because the authors are obligated to consider all the literature in a given topic area. This policy reassures readers that they are being informed about all developments in the area; therefore, they can rely on the Review for current awareness.

These are examples of replies in favor of commissioned articles:

> Insures that needed fields are not neglected.
>
> Prefer format presently used--is unique and helpful--to change would be to duplicate.
>
> The present method presents a more comprehensive overview which is more useful to me--I can look up special references as needed.

A policy of volunteered articles does not guarantee complete coverage of the literature in all topic areas. However, respondents who favor this policy believe that the articles could review diverse, specialized areas without losing the interest of the average reader.

These are examples of replies in favor of volunteered articles:

> Volunteered articles would help push current research and cut the lag between the idea and implementation.
>
> Is it not possible to get better articles from a larger pool than when one uses a "commissioned" pool? There is much good research being done by people who have not reached the "commissioned" position.

A combination of volunteered articles and commissioned articles is the most popular policy. Commissioned articles would preserve comprehensiveness while volunteered articles would provide flexibility in the journal's content, a change in the cycle of review of certain

topics, and diversity of reviewers' opinions.

These are examples of replies in favor of a combination policy:

> Commissioning some would insure coverage; volunteers would compete.
>
> It would make the Review more exciting, while retaining its reference convenience.
>
> Sometimes there is a tendency to mention works of questionable value when a strict cycle is adhered to. If, in some areas, the Review were to wait until more material had been published--and other topics more prevalent in current thinking were reviewed more frequently--the Review might be improved.

Additional suggestions for improving the Review are included in the Summary and Conclusions section of this report.

VI. POTENTIAL FOR AN ANNUAL REVIEW OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Basic Results

A major objective of this study was to determine the potential for an annual review of the literature in educational research. The data indicate that an annual review would be welcomed in this field.

The major evidence for this conclusion is the question:

> If all 15 topics from the 3-year "cycle" of the Review were combined in an annual publication that covered only the previous year's literature, how valuable would this be to you? Why?

(Results)

More valuable than the Review in a 3-year cycle	50%
About as valuable as the Review now is	18
Less valuable than the Review in a 3-year cycle	27
Non-response	5
	100%

Why?_____

Half the respondents would prefer an annual review to a 3-year cycle review; further, over two-thirds are confident that an annual review would be no less valuable than the current form of the Review.

Seventy-six percent of the sample responded to the "Why?" portion of the question. Many of the reasons given in favor of an annual review were also cited in favor of the 3-year Review of Educational Research. For example, both types of reviews were thought to be "easier to use." Ease of use probably refers to such factors as retrieval, indexing, and bibliographies. In addition, frequently cited reasons for preferring an annual review are that it would be more current and up-to-date; frequently cited reasons for preferring the 3-year cycle

of the Review are that it gives a better perspective and understanding of progress in the field during the 3-year period. Thus, respondents have different views of the rate of progress in educational research. These are examples of reasons given both pro and con an annual review:

(An annual review would be MORE VALUABLE:)

More up-to-date coverage.

Easier to organize in personal library.

Easier to keep up with current research literature, which is proliferating at a very fast pace. Three-year cycles seem much too long to wait.

Two-thirds of the material would reach me two years earlier.

In a lifetime of professional work, I now see only 15 complete cycles of the Review!

(An annual review would be LESS VALUABLE:)

Shorter cycles would provide less organization and include more trivia.

Three-year cycle permits discussion of trends and overall picture.

It would be a hindrance in reviewing research if we had to look through every yearbook, rather than one every three years. Also, the one-year reviews would tend to be hasty and superficial.

I'm not interested in some topics.

I'd be more apt to pick up a small publication of related materials and read all or part than I would be to go through a large publication containing many diverse topics.

There is not enough pertinent research of sufficient quality in a single year to warrant such a review.

(An annual review would be ABOUT AS VALUABLE as the Review:)

> Value of timeliness must be weighed against the value of better (3-year) perspective.
>
> Would keep the review more current, but would give less perspective.
>
> Now I wait 3 years for my area of interest; anually I'd get a lot of up-to-date information on areas in which I have little interest.

Who are These People?

Those who replied to the annual review question are fairly representative of the entire group of survey respondents. Opinion about an annual review does not hinge on a respondent's principal employer, primary specialty, highest earned degree, or institution where the degree was earned. However, those who earned their highest degree after 1965 tend to believe that an annual review would be more valuable. This probably indicates their acute awareness of the rate of literature expansion in educational research. Furthermore, those who obtained their highest degree in the general field of Education tend to opt for an annual review. This might reflect their belief that the diversity in their interests could be encompassed by a review of the literature.

Finally, while authorship of journal articles and papers does not affect opinion as to the value of an annual review, authorship of books, and of chapters in books does. Those who foresee less value tend to be book authors. These do not seem to be particularly meaningful findings.

We conclude that, despite these small deviations for specific demographic traits of respondents, opinion as to the value of an annual

review does not hinge on any particular respondent traits. Thus, one respondent's opinion is as meaningful as another's. The strong preference for an annual review does not need to be qualified.

Indirect Evidence in Support of an Annual Review

Several other survey findings suggest that educational researchers could benefit from an annual review.

First, we have found that respondents process information actively--that is, they read several journals regularly and are energetic authors of papers and journal articles. An authoritative, critical overview of this information would help them organize it in their own minds and they would thus gain a better perspective on developments in educational research. The Review provides a critical look, but the full cycle of issues takes three years. An annual review could compress the cycle *and maintain the critique.* It could also offer features such as a cumulative bibliography or index, or a summary/outlook chapter as well. The Review of Educational Research could offer these features, too, but they might not be as effective if they were published separately.

Second, the data have shown that the main use of the Review is as a current awareness tool. As an additional tool for current awareness, an annual review would probably cite slightly different literature and would present a different point of view. An annual review should not be conceived as a replacement for the Review of Educational Research, however. The two (or, eventually, more) review publications might be designed for different audiences:

> --specialists who need to keep up in their own areas as well as increase their knowledge about peripheral areas,

--administrators and policy-makers who need to allocate funds and make decisions with full knowledge of all developments in the field, and

--students and others who need a clear, concise introduction to various topics in educational research.

Thus, even though we have found that users of the current Review do not sway too much from their areas of specialization when they use the journal, it seems possible to collect diverse chapters in an annual review, make the format attractive enough to capture the attention of these specialists, and lure them into browsing through the book. Useful information is often discovered as a result of browsing, so the appeal to browsers should not be discounted as a desirable feature in an annual review, or in the Review of Educational Research, for that matter.

A third bit of evidence in support of an annual review is the impact or stimulative effect that the Review has had on users' information-seeking habits. An annual review also stimulates information-seeking,[1] but at an accelerated pace. The faster pace implies more efficiency in overall information exchange activity so that those who try to obtain a cited publication, for example, may not only get the publication but also decide to contact the author or contemplate a new research project as a result. Ultimately, the consequence of such information-seeking and information exchange activity will be advances in knowledge in educational research.

---

[1]Cuadra, Carlos A., Linda Harris, and Robert V. Katter, FINAL REPORT--Impact Study of the Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, TM-4125, System Development Corp., Santa Monica, Calif., November, 1968.

It must be reiterated that an annual review of educational research should not replace the Review, but should complement it and thus enrich the information sources available to researchers. Evidence from other information use studies shows that, in general, use by scientists of one information source does not displace use of other sources. Rather, greater use of one leads to greater use of the others. A researcher's maximum use of all the information sources available to him ultimately depends on his own abilities and interests.

VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This survey has provided rich information about the use and users of the Review of Educational Research. We have suggested some changes that can be made in the format and editorial policy of the Review, and we have shown that an annual review of educational research is desirable. Now, we can summarize the survey findings and add to the list of potential changes in the Review.

A. Summary of Major Findings

B. Changes Explicitly Suggested by Respondents

C. Changes Inferred from the Survey Data

A. Summary of Major Findings

1. The current users are an elite group: they are active in teaching, research, and administration; half have recent PhD's, with many of these awarded by a top quality graduate school; and they are active authors and readers of other journals. Interpersonal communication undoubtedly plays an important role in their information exchange behavior, too.

2. Most of the respondents feel that the cycle of the Review should be changed so that some topics are reviewed more often than every three years, and some reviewed only every four or five years.

The three most popular issues--that is, those that should be reviewed more often--are:

- -Instructional Materials: Educational Media and Technology
- -Growth, Development, and Learning
- -Methodology of Educational Research

The three least popular are:

- -International Development Education
- -Educational Organization, Administration, and Finance
- -Language Arts and Fine Arts

These preferences are probably based on use of the Review, for the most popular issues tend to be used by the greatest number of respondents.

3. Overall use of the Review is moderate. The journal is skimmed and read selectively more than it is read extensively. The reason for this is that users tend to read extensively only in issues covering their areas of specialization.

4. The Review is used for at least eight different purposes--and this is unusual for a single information tool. The main uses are for current awareness and for learning about an area peripheral to one's specialty. Surprisingly, the Review is not used very much for reference or for teaching--this despite the high proportion of teachers among the respondents.

5. The Review affects researchers' information-seeking behavior in several ways, notably in prompting them to try to obtain and read cited publications. The consequences of use that affect the largest numbers of respondents are recognizing cited publications and gaining a new perspective on educational research.

6. Respondents tend to read only the issues that cover their areas of specialization.

7. Consultants and administrators skim or read many issues selectively because they must be knowledgeable about many topics. Teachers and researchers skim sometimes, and read extensively at other times because their information needs probably vary more. And students don't use the Review very much at all because their information needs depend on courses and projects, which may not require them to maintain current awareness in several fields over a long period of time.

8. Half the respondents think that an annual review of educational research would be more valuable than the Review in a three-year cycle.

B. Changes Explicitly Suggested by Respondents

Among the explicit suggestions given by respondents are improving the style of writing, evaluating the literature more critically and in more detail, selecting highly competent and knowledgeable authors, and standardizing the quality of the issues. Among the suggested new topics for review, four major areas stand out: Teacher-administration relations, urban education and school desegregation, the "systems" approach to education, and computer applications in education. Finally, respondents foresee improvement in the Review if each issue were to contain a combination of commissioned and volunteered articles. This policy would preserve comprehensive coverage of the literature and it would also provide diverse opinions and flexible review cycles.

The decision to implement these suggestions rests with the Review editor and his advisory board. Some of the suggestions would be easy to implement, and some would be more difficult. But there is no reason for not changing some aspects of the Review--even if on an experimental basis only.

One of the first changes might be to substitute some of the suggested new topics for those reviewed in the least popular issues, such as "Language Arts and Fine Arts." A rough measure of the readership of the new topics might be obtained by enclosing in each of the issues a brief postcard questionnaire that could be returned by mail.

C. Changes Inferred from the Survey Data

The author will now recommend changes in the Review, based on an interpretation of the survey data.

Changes in the Review's format might facilitate more extensive use of each issue. One way to help the reader identify the most important literature and conclusions is to print them in boldface type. Use of several sub-titles within each article is another aid to the eye. Better subject indexing and a cumulative bibliography in each issue could also be very effective.

Just as important as changes in format, of course, are changes in the contents of each issue. An overview, summary, or critique of the entire issue[1] might attract readers who do not necessarily specialize in the topic being reviewed in that issue. A forum of conflicting points of view about each topic, possibly the result of volunteered articles, might accomplish the same thing. Other features that could be included in each issue to attract general audiences are a list of future review authors and topics, a list of important research in progress at various locations, brief reviews of new literature, and selective bibliographies on popular or controversial topics.

To aid readers who use an issue extensively because it reviews literature in their specialties, a cumulative bibliography could be included. Information on the availability of the cited publications would probably be very popular, especially since the survey results show that over a third of the respondents tried to obtain some cited

---

[1]This type of wrap-up has appeared in some of the issues both before and after this study was conducted.

publications for at least one issue of the Review. Finally, a section on research in progress in that particular topic area should also be welcomed.

The goal of changes like these is to cultivate a large group of educational researchers who look at each issue regularly and consistently find valuable information. The researchers would represent many specialties and job activities with different information requirements, but each issue could include some feature to satisfy those requirements. For example, specialists in educational media and teaching techniques might be expected to read the issue "Instructional Materials: Educational Media and Technology" in detail. But administrators who have to weigh time allocated for programed instruction against time allocated for classroom instruction might also peruse this issue to learn the latest developments on the effectiveness of programed instruction. And if the issue included a list of research in progress, many other educational researchers might also browse through it.

Thus, educational researchers would continue to use the Review for several different purposes. Current awareness should remain a major use. Learning about areas peripheral to one's specialty would be the result of features that appeal to general audiences, for they might browse through the issue after looking for the feature that interests them. The reference value of the journal would be enhanced by including a cumulative bibliography in each issue, and possibly by publishing a single, separate bibliography for a complete cycle of 15 issues. Use of the Review for teaching could expand too, due to cumulative bibliographies, more critical writing, or any change that would orient students to educational research without snowing them with complex details.

Changes in the Review should encourage further information-seeking as a consequence of Review use, too. More people might try to obtain cited publications if the availability of these publications were listed in the Review. More researchers might also try to contact an author if a cumulative bibliography showed that the author was particularly productive in a certain topic area. Information-seeking in other areas might also be accelerated with changes in the Review.

A final point is this: the Review of Educational Research and an annual review of the literature in educational research certainly can co-exist. They would complement each other by reviewing the literature for different periods of time and for different sub-topics within educational research. Some overlap would not be harmful at all.

Review users are now a very elite group--presumably the leaders in educational research. If the Review continues to attract elite users, and if its writing style and level of criticism are strengthened, it could perceptively influence the direction and quality of research in education.

TABLE

Table I Basic Results

HOW OFTEN SHOULD THIS TOPIC BE REVIEWED?

(---This topic should be:)

Title of Issue	Non-Response	Retained As Is	Reviewed More Often	Reviewed Less Often	Excluded	Modified or Sub-divided
International Development Education*	10 %	50 %	12 %	23 %	4 %	1 %
Instructional Materials: Educational Media and Technology	7	34	54	3	1	1
Educational and Psychological Testing	7	45	41	6	0	1
Growth, Development, and Learning	7	37	48	3	0	3
Educational Organization, Administration, and Finance	10	47	18	21	3	1
Teacher Personnel	9	49	21	17	3	1
Language Arts and Fine Arts	10	48	17	17	4	4
Philosophical and Social Framework of Education	8	36	15	17	3	1
Methodology of Educational Research	7	43	45	4	0	1
Educational Programs: Adolescence	10	49	23	12	3	3
Curriculum Planning and Development	9	46	37	6	1	1
Guidance, Counseling, and Personnel Services	9	34	23	12	2	0
Education of Exceptional Children	10	32	27	8	2	1
Higher Education	10	33	21	12	1	1
Education for Socially Disadvantaged Children	9	38	45	5	2	1

*Issues are listed in reverse chronological order.

Table II

RANKING OF ISSUES ACCORDING TO POPULARITY OR THOSE THAT SHOULD BE REVIEWED MORE OFTEN*

The Most Popular Issues:

Instructional Materials: Educational Media and Technology

Growth, Development, and Learning

** [Methodology of Educational Research

** Education for Socially Disadvantaged Children]

Educational and Psychological Testing

Curriculum Planning and Development

Education of Exceptional Children

[Educational Programs: Adolescence

Guidance, Counseling, and Personnel Services]

[Higher Education

Teacher Personnel]

Philosophical and Social Framework of Education

Educational Organization, Administration, and Finance

Language Arts and Fine Arts

The Least Popular Issues

International Development Education

*Ranking the titles by those that should be reviewed "less often" would place them in almost exactly the reverse order.

**Titles in brackets have equivalent ranks.

Table III

CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSE:
FREQUENCY OF REVIEW

How often should topics be reviewed?	Number of Issues Rated														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Retained As Is (N = 497)	3%	7	10	17	25	34	46	60	69	78	83	88	89	92	100%
Reviewed More Often (N = 460)	8%	17	29	41	55	68	79	84	88	91	93	94	95	96	100%
Reviewed Less Often (N = 283)	22%	45	58	75	84	91	94	98	99	100%					
Excluded (N = 94)	56%	80	91	97	98			100%							
Modified (N = 70)	62%	84	88	92	95	98				100%					

(Maximum N = 572)

Table IV Basic Results

HOW MUCH DID YOU USE THIS ISSUE?

Title of Issue	Non-Response	Don't Remember, Didn't See it	Saw it, But didn't Use it	Only Skimmed It	Read Selected Parts	Read Almost Entire Issue / N= 572
International Development Education*	6 %	22 %	27 %	26 %	14 %	5 %
Instructional Materials: Educational Media and Technology	5	7	10	23	34	21
Educational and Psychological Testing	5	6	8	17	35	29
Growth, Development, and Learning	6	7	6	21	32	28
Educational Organization, Administration, and Finance	7	20	26	20	15	12
Teacher Personnel	7	18	20	23	22	10
Language Arts and Fine Arts	6	20	26	22	15	11
Philosophical and Social Framework of Education	7	16	19	28	21	9
Methodology of Educational Research	6	7	8	15	35	29
Educational Programs: Adolescence	7	21	16	25	22	9
Curriculum Planning and Development	6	13	14	24	26	17
Guidance, Counseling, and Personnel Services	7	16	18	26	21	12
Education of Exceptional Children	7	17	20	23	22	11
Higher Education	7	17	20	25	19	12
Education for Socially Disadvantaged Children	8	17	10	20	25	20

*Issues are listed in reverse chronological order.

Table V

RANKING OF ISSUES ACCORDING TO EXTENT OF USE, BASED ON THE AVERAGE USE OF EACH ISSUE FOR SKIMMING, SELECTIVE READING, AND EXTENSIVE READING

Issues Used the Most

↓

Issues Used the Least

**	[Educational and Psychological Testing
	[Growth, Development, and Learning
	Methodology of Educational Research
	Instructional Materials: Educational Media and Technology
	Curriculum Planning and Development
	Education for Socially Disadvantaged Children
	Guidance, Counseling, and Personnel Services
	Philosophical and Social Framework of Education
	[Educational Programs: Adolescence
	[Education of Exceptional Children
	[Higher Education
	Teacher Personnel
	Language Arts and Fine Arts
	Educational Organization, Administration, and Finance
	International Development Education

**Titles in brackets have equivalent ranks.

Table VI

CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSE: EXTENT OF USE

How were issued used?	Number of Issues Used														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Skimmed (N = 468)	15%	30	45	62	77	85	91	94	96	97	98	99			100%
Read selected parts (N = 490)	12%	25	44	64	77	86	94	96	97	98					100%
Read almost entire issue (N = 435)	29%	51	69	80	87	93	97	98	99						100%

(Maximum N = 572)

Table VII

CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSE:
USE OF THE REVIEW FOR DIFFERENT PURPOSES

Purpose:	Number of Issues Used for Each Purpose														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
To keep up with current work in my specialty (N = 457)	17%	38	56	70	80	87	90	92	94	96	97		98		100%
To make sure I hadn't missed important lit. (N = 384)	19%	39	57	68	76	85	89	93	95	96	97	98			100%
To learn about an area outside my specialty (N = 402)	15%	27	39	49	58	69	75	80	85	89	92	94	96	98	100%
To verify a fact or conclusion (N = 131)	45%	63	72	79	84	90	92			94	95	97	98		100%
To check a reference (N = 134)	44%	64	77	81	87	92	96	98				100%			
To teach a course (N = 161)	37%	54	68	76	84	92	95	96				97		98	100%
To prepare a lecture or speech (N = 151)	40%	60	71	81	86	95	96	99	100%						
To write a paper or report (N = 217)	40%	61	75	84	89	94	97	98		99	100%				

(Maximum N = 572)

Table VIII

CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSE:
IMPACT OF THE REVIEW

Consequence of Use:	Number of Issues for Each Consequence														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
I recognized cited publications (N = 379)	15%	30	47	58	67	76	79	83	87	90	92	94	95	96	100%
I tried to obtain cited publications (N = 214)	34%	54	69	77	85	93	96	97	98		99				100%
I read a cited publication (N = 268)	24%	41	63	74	84	90	94	95	97	98	99				100%
I tried to contact an author (N = 78)	51%	72	86	91	96	100%									
I prepared a bibliography (N = 159)	38%	63	79	88	91	94	97								100%
I modified a research project (N = 135)	54%	76	89	95	97	99	100%								
I gained a new perspective on educational res. (N = 286)	32%	51	62	70	77	83	86	88	90	91	92			94	100%

(Maximum N = 572)

Table IX

DEVIATIONS* FROM EXPECTED USE OF EACH ISSUE, DUE TO PROFESSIONAL SPECIALTY

Title of Issues:	Specialties:** Tests, Method.	Mater., Tech.	Edu. Admin.	Coun-seling	Type of Student	Sub-ject	This issue used by:
N=	(134)	(89)	(71)	(25)	(122)	(32)	
	- SKIM - READ + READ	+ SKIM + READ - READ	+ SKIM - READ - READ	- SKIM + READ + READ	+ SKIM READ - READ	SKIM + READ - READ	
Educ. & Psych. Testing							81%
Growth, Devel., & Learning			+ -	- +	- +	+ -	81
Methodology of Edu. Res.	- - +	-	+ + -	-	+ -	+ +	79
Instructional Materials	+ -	- - +		+ - -	- +	+ -	78
Curric. Planning & Devel.	+ - -	- +	- +	+ + -	+	+	67
Education for Socially Disadvantaged Children	+ -		- +	+	+	- -	65
Guidance, Counseling, & Personnel Services	+	+ -	- + -	- - +	+ -	+ -	59
Phil. and Soc. Framework of Education	- -		- +	+ + -	+	+	58
Edu. Programs: Adolescence	+ -		-	+ +	- +	+	56
Edu. of Exceptional Children	+ -	+	-	+	+	- - -	56
Higher Education	-		+	+ -	- + +	+ -	56
Teacher Personnel	-	-	+ +	+	+	- -	55
Language Arts and Fine Arts	- -	+ +	-	- - -	+ +	- - +	48
Educational Organization, Administration, & Finance	+ - -		- + +	+ -	+	- -	47
International Devel. Edu.	-	-	+			+ -	45%

*The "+" and "-" deviation notation is explained on page 29.

**See page 28 for definition of these categories.

Table X

DEVIATIONS* FROM EXPECTED USE OF EACH ISSUE, DUE TO JOB ACTIVITY

Title of Issue:	Activities** Teach/ Res. N = (145)		Teach/ Admin. (46)		Res./ Admin. (72)		Consul. (92)		Students (85)		This issue used by:
	SKIM	READ	SKIM	READ	SKIM	READ	SKIM	READ - READ +	SKIM	READ	
Edu. and Psych. Testing											81%
Growth, Devel., & Learning		+				+		+		-	81
Methodology of Edu. Res.		- +				-		+ -			79
Instructional Materials								+		-	78
Curric. Planning & Devel.	+	-						+		-	67
Education for Socially Disadvantaged Children			+			+		+ +		- -	65
Guidance, Counseling, & Personnel Services	+	-		+		+		+		- -	59
Phil. & Soc. Framework of Education		+						+			58
Edu. Programs: Adolescence								+			56
Educ. of Exceptional Children						-		+			56
Higher Education	+			+						- -	56
Teacher Personnel								+		- - +	55
Language Arts & Fine Arts	+					+ -		+ - +		- -	48
Educational Organization, Administration, & Finance	-			+		+ + +		+		-	47
International Devel. Edu.						+		+		+	45%

*The "+" and "-" deviation notation is explained on page 29.

**See page 27 for definition of these categories.

Table XI
CORRELATES OF EIGHT REASONS FOR USING THE REVIEW*

Consequences of Use:	Job Activity					Professional Background								Productivity (Last 5 Years)		
								(Field of Degree:)								
	Teaching/ Research	Teaching/ Admin.	Research Admin.	Consulting	Studying	Highest Deg. is a PhD	Highest Deg. from Major School	Highest Deg. After 1965	Edu. Psych.	General Edu.	Curric., Guidance	Edu. Admin.	More than 4 Papers**	Journal Articles	Chapters in Books	Books
To keep up with current literature (N = 457)																
To make sure important lit. is not missed (N = 384)	+													+		
To learn about a new area (N = 402)																
To verify a fact (N = 131)	+				-	+		+					+	+	-	
To check a reference (N = 134)	+												+	+		
To teach a course (N = 161)	+	+	-	+	-	+		+	+		+		+	+		
To prepare a lecture or speech (N = 151)	+			+	-	+							+	+	+	
To write a paper or report (N = 217)								+				+	+			

*Variables are correlated with the 8 reasons through frequency tables only. Deviations from expected frequencies are shown in the table. The "+" and "-" notation is explained on page 29.
**Four is the number of papers written by half of all respondents.

Table XII
CORRELATES OF SEVEN CONSEQUENCES OF USING THE REVIEW*

Consequences of Use:	Job Activity					Professional Background							Productivity (Last 5 Years)			
								(Field of Degree:)								
	Teaching/ Research	Teaching/ Admin.	Research Admin.	Consulting	Studying	Highest Deg. is a PhD	Highest Deg. From Major School	Highest Deg. After 1965	Edu. Psych.	Edu. General Edu.	Curric., Guidance	Admin.	More than 4 Papers**	Journal Articles	Chapters in Books	Books
Recognizing cited publications (N = 379)																
Trying to obtain cited publications (N = 214)	+				-	+					+		+	+		
Reading a cited publication (N = 268)	+					+								+		
Trying to contact an author (N = 78)	+			-		+	+				-	+	+	+	+	
Preparing a bibliography (N = 159)	+		-										+	+	+	
Modifying a research project (N = 135)	+	-				+		+				+	+	+		+
Gaining a new perspective (N = 286)											+					

*Variables are correlated with the 7 consequences through frequency tables only. Deviations from expected frequencies are shown in the table. The "+" and "-" notation is explained on page 29.
**Four is the number of papers written by half of all respondents.

APPENDICES

I. Demographic Characteristics of the 372 Respondents

II. The Questionnaire

Appendix I

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE 572 RESPONDENTS

Principal Employer:	RESPONSE PERCENTAGE
College or University	68%
Industrial or Business Firm	2
Government Agency	7
Non-profit Organization	8
Elementary or Secondary School	7
Other	5
Non-response	3

Job Activities:	Primary	Secondary
Teaching	39%	15%
Research	19	36
Administration	22	10
Consulting	4	14
Writing	2	8
Studying for a degree	10	6
Other	3	2
Non-response	1	9

Professional Specialties:	Primary	Secondary
Tests, Measurement, and Research Methodology	23%	15%
Teaching Techniques and Practices	5	5
Teaching Aids and Educational Media	3	5
Educational Facilities	1	1
Curriculum Development	7	7
Educational Administration	12	4
Counseling	4	3
School-Community Relationships	0	1
Teacher Education	9	8
Higher Education	3	5
Secondary Education	2	3
Childhood Education	4	2
Education of Exceptional Children	3	4
Education of the Disadvantaged	1	1
Vocational and Technical Education	1	5
International Education	1	1
Science Education	2	1
English Communication Skills	1	1
Foreign Languages and Linguistics	0	1
Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences	1	1
Other (especially Mathematics Education, and "Research")	14	6
Non-response	3	20

Appendix I, cont.

	RESPONSE PERCENTAGE
Highest Earned Degree:	
B.A., B.S., or B.L.S.	3%
M.A., M.S., M.L.S., or M.Ed.	29
Ed.D.	22
Ph.D., M.D.	44
Other	1
Non-response	1
Institution of Highest Degree	
Minor	52%
Major*	47
Non-response	1

* These are the top 20 institutions in Letters and Science, according to the Carrter Report, An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education, by Allan M. Carrter (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966): Harvard, U.C.--Berkeley, Yale, Princeton, Chicago, Stanford, Michigan, Wisconsin, Columbia, UCLA, John Hopkins, Cornell, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, Indiana, Northwestern, U. of Washington, Texas, North Carolina, Brown, NYU, Ohio State, Washington U., Duke.

	RESPONSE PERCENTAGE
Year of Highest Degree	
before 1935	3%
1935-1940	3
1941-1945	2
1946-1950	5
1951-1955	11
1956-1960	16
1961-1965	30
after 1965	28
Non-response	2

	RESPONSE PERCENTAGE
Major Field for Highest Degree	
Educational Psychology	15%
Guidance and Counseling	6
Curriculum	7
Educational Administration	15
Other Education fields	32
Psychology or Sociology	10
English or History	2
Other	12
Non-response	1
Number of Journals Read Regularly	
One-three (low)	25%
Four-six (medium)	47
Seven or more (high)	24
Non-response	4
Authorship	
Papers:	
One-four	39%
Five-ten	25
Eleven or more	17
Non-response	18
Journal Articles:	
One-three	35%
Four or more	26
Non-response	39
Chapters in Books:	
One	13%
Two	6
Three or more	7
Non-response	74
Books:	
One	13%
Two	3
Three or more	4
Non-response	80

Appendix II--THE QUESTIONNAIRE

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305

August 12, 1968

INSTITUTE FOR COMMUNICATION RESEARCH

CYPRESS HALL
Telephone:
415/321-2300
Extension 2753

Dear Colleague:

This brief questionnaire on the Review of Educational Research is part of a broad A.E.R.A. study of information sources used by educational researchers.* We are eager to have the benefit of your professional experience for this study. Would you please take a few minutes to complete the questionnaire and return it in the envelope provided? The identification number is to permit us to contact non-respondents, in accordance with standard sampling procedures. The information you provide will not be associated with your name in data analysis.

Thank you for your cooperation. We're looking forward to hearing from you soon.

Linda Harris
Study Director

*Some A.E.R.A. members have already completed other questionnaires in this study. Ours does not duplicate these, but will provide important additional data on information use in educational research.

---

1. The present policy of the Review of Educational Research is to commission articles on topics that are normally reviewed every 3 years. Would you prefer a review journal like the Psychological Bulletin, in which articles are spontaneously contributed as often as research in a particular specialty merits the additional coverage? I WOULD PREFER:

   ___ commissioned articles ___ volunteered articles ___ a combination of both

   Please comment. How would the policy you prefer affect the quality of the Review?

   _____

   _____

2. If all 15 topics from the 3-year "cycle" of the Review were combined in an annual publication that covered only the previous year's literature, how valuable would this be to you?

   ___ More valuable than the Review in a 3-year cycle ___ About as valuable as the Review now is ___ Less valuable than the Review in a 3-year cycle

   Why? _____

   _____

Center Fold of the Questionnaire

3. Part of our study focuses on the 15 issues of the Review that have been published in the past
each topic, please circle the number that corresponds to your choices from the top of each col

TOPICS	HOW OFTEN SHOULD THIS TOPIC BE REVIEWED? (Circle the most appropriate choice.)	HOW MUCH DID YO (Circle the most
	This topic should be:	1--I don't rememb
		2--I saw it, but
	1--retained as is (reviewed every 3 years)	3--I only skimmed
	2--reviewed more often	4--I read selecte
	3--reviewed less often	5--I read almost
	4--excluded from the Review	
	5--modified or sub-divided: Please list new titles in question 4 below	
International Development Education	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Instructional Materials: Educational Media and Technology	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Educational and Psychological Testing	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Growth, Development, and Learning	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Educational Organization, Administration, and Finance	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Teacher Personnel	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Language Arts and Fine Arts	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Philosophical and Social Framework of Education	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Methodology of Educational Research	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Educational Programs: Adolescence	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Curriculum Planning and Development	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Guidance, Counseling, and Personnel Services	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Education of Exceptional Children	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Higher Education	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Education for Socially Disadvantaged Children	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3

4. Please list new or revised topics you would like to see reviewed. _____

_____

_____

_____

3-year cycle. The topics of these issues are listed in the left-most column below. Opposite
umn.

U USE THIS ISSUE? appropriate choice.)	WHAT DID YOU USE THIS ISSUE FOR? (Circle all choices that apply.)	WHAT HAPPENED AS YOU USED THIS ISSUE? (Circle all choices that apply.)
er/I didn't see it didn't use it it d parts the entire issue	1--To keep up with current work in my specialty 2--To make sure I hadn't missed important literature in my specialty 3--To learn about an area outside my specialty 4--To verify a fact or conclusion 5--To check a reference 6--To teach a course 7--To prepare a lecture or speech 8--To write a paper or report	1--I recognized some cited publications from previous reading 2--I tried to obtain cited publications 3--I read a cited publication 4--I tried to contact the author of a publication 5--I prepared a bibliography of my own 6--I modified a current research project 7--I gained a new perspective on educational research
4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4 5	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. Please evaluate the general quality of the Review in terms of the authors' style, coverage of the literature, etc. Can you suggest ways to improve the Review in the future? _____

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Which of the following best describes your principal employer?

___ college or university ___ industrial or business firm __ government agency

___ non-profit organization ___ elementary or secondary school ___ other: _____

Please indicate your primary and secondary job activities by placing a 1 and 2 on the appropriate lines below.

___ teaching ___ research ___ administration ___ consulting

___ writing ___ studying for a degree ___ other: _____

Please indicate your primary specialty--that is, the area in which you are most active or interested--by placing a 1 on the appropriate line below. If you have a second specialty, place a 2 on the appropriate line below.

___ Tests, Measurement, and Research Methodology
___ Teaching Techniques and Practices
___ Teaching Aids and Educational Media
___ Educational Facilities
___ Curriculum Development
___ Educational Administration
___ Counseling
___ School-Community Relationships
___ Teacher Education
___ Higher Education
___ Secondary Education
___ Childhood Education
___ Education of Exceptional Children
___ Education of the Disadvantaged
___ Vocational and Technical Education
___ International Education
___ Science Education
___ English Communication Skills
___ Foreign Languages and Linguistics
___ Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences
___ Other: _____

What is your highest earned degree? _____ Where was it earned? _____

When was it earned? _____ In what field? _____

Which professional journals and periodicals do you read or scan regularly (that is, almost every issue)? _____

_____

_____

Approximately <u>how</u> <u>many</u> of each of the following materials have you authored or co-authored in the past <u>5</u> years?

___ unpublished papers, technical reports, monographs ___ journal articles

___ chapters in books ___ books